



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                        | .                         | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/347,523                             |                           | 07/06/1999  | YOSHIYUKI GOMI          | 103229              | 3978             |
| 25944                                  | 7590                      | 03/31/2004  |                         | EXAMINER            |                  |
| OLIFF &                                |                           | GE, PLC     | NGUYEN, DUNG T          |                     |                  |
| P.O. BOX 19928<br>ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 |                           |             |                         | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  | , , , , , , , , , , , , , |             |                         | 2871                |                  |
|  |                           |             | DATE MAILED: 03/31/2004 |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/347,523   | GOMI, YOSHIYUKI   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advicery Action   | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Dung Nguyen  | 2871  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | correspondence address  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 16 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE 1 Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi  | cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | EPLY [check either a) or b)]   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>03</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions. | visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE term on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the | f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF  | •  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or  | in better form for appeal by mat   | erially reducing or simplifying the   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:   | ling a corresponding number of   | finally rejected claims.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection   | ction(s):  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5, 7, 8, 10 and 11</u> .  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| □ The drawing correction filed on is a) □ approved or b) □ disapproved by the Examiner.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| . Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |  | Dung Nguyen   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | Dung Nguyen Primary Examiner  |  |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims do not define over the art of record. Applicant's responses have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

DUNGT. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER